

## CHOLERA HOGS FOR INSANE

Hogs from a Drove Affected with Cholera Served to Insane Patients.

Testimony Taken Before the Legislative Committee—Infamy of the Co-Harrison-Sullivan Insane Hospital Ring.

In 1886 a committee representing the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association, and consisting of Hon. Wm. D. Poole, Oliver T. Morton and Louis Howland, investigated the present Democratic management of the Insane Hospital. They were assisted in their labors by Lucius B. Swift and A. A. McKain. The report made by the committee contained the following extract:

"It may be well to state in this connection that between Dec. 9, 1884, and July 30, 1885, 14,213 pounds of dead hogs were sold by the asylum for fertilizing purposes. Most of these hogs died soon after they were purchased by the board. How much disease pork finds its way to the tables of the patients it is impossible to say, since the annual report contains only the record of the hogs which were so badly diseased that they died before they could be sold, and were sold. There is no doubt that a great deal of diseased meat has been consumed as food. Of over 600 hogs purchased more than half died. One lot were apparently 'death-stricken' when delivered at the hospital. They began to die rapidly, and at the same time slaughtering went on for the tables. It was not until the hogs were sold that the butchers' knife was used."

This charge was hotly denied by the trustees of the Democratic press. A legislative investigation followed, and the Democratic "whitewashing" committee had the effrontery to say that "the testimony for the defense shows conclusively that no hogs ever died out there with cholera." The following evidence shows the reckless mendacity of this statement, and emphasizes the necessity of expelling the corrupt board of trustees now in control of the institution:

From the testimony of Dr. Thomas H. Harrison, President of the Board of Trustees, House report.

Question. How many hogs have you bought during your administration?

Answer. I would think as many as 1,500 hogs.

Q. How many have died?

A. I would say a couple of hundred—from 200 to 300.

Q. Is that not a good many out of 1,500?

A. When cholera strikes them they all go. They said it was cholera. There were two years that we were very successful; we never lost any hogs.

Q. How fast did they die?

A. They died within a few days or a few weeks.

From the testimony of James Orrall, p. 362. House report.

Question. Did you ever see any killed from a dying drove where hogs were lying dead from disease or cholera?

Answer. At the time hogs were dressed I have seen hogs lying in the lot.

Q. Where the hogs were dressed?

A. In a lot where the hogs were being dressed.

Q. And those hogs had died of cholera?

A. Those that were lying there were supposed to have died from cholera.

Q. They had all the indications, did they?

A. Yes, sir.

From the testimony of Dr. Fletcher, p. 373.

Question—Do you know of any hogs that were bought from Mr. Landers for the asylum?

Answer—I understood they were bought from him.

Q. You have in mind the particular lot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you notice their appearance particularly as to being well or diseased?

A. I did not myself at the time they were brought the first day.

Q. How long before you did, if you did at all?

A. My attention was called to them by the farmer.

Q. In how long a time?

A. I think the second day.

Q. What did you discover then?

A. He reported that one or two of the hogs were sick when they arrived, and he said he would be anything that fifty of them would be dead in ten days.

Q. How did it turn out?

A. I do not think that fifty died in ten days; but afterward a large number did.

Q. Of that lot?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of any hogs being bought from a man on J. J. Cooper's farm?

A. I understand that hogs were bought there; I did not see them.

Q. Did these hogs have cholera?

A. I do not know, but I think that all died in about the same manner, and it was properly called cholera.

Q. The October hogs died, too?

A. I think they did. The records of the hospital ought to show that.

Q. In what year was this hog cholera down there to such extent?

A. I think in 1884, 1885 and 1886—1884 and 1885 at any rate.

From the testimony of Richard Jacks, p. 302.

Question. I will ask you to state if, at any time while you were there employed as a brick mason, you saw any dead hogs?

Answer. I did.

Q. How many times?

A. I could not tell you how many times I have seen that, but different times.

Q. What is your best impression as to the number of times?

A. I suppose a half a dozen.

Q. Do you know what those hogs died of?

A. I do not, positively. My impression was that they died of cholera.

Q. How many dead hogs at any one time did you see in the field or pen?

A. The most I ever saw was thirteen.

Q. You saw thirteen dead there at one time, did you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And those thirteen hogs you saw there dead at one time you think died of cholera?

A. I think so.

Q. State if at the time you saw the cholera hogs that were dead in the pen or field, whether they were slaughtering hogs in the same place?

A. I did at one other time.

Q. How many hogs were dead at this other time you speak of?

A. I did not see but two or three.

Q. And they were killing hogs then?

A. Yes, sir. I saw them kill two.

From the testimony of Douglas McClain, p. 106.

Question. I will ask you to state, Mr. McClain, if at any time while you were there anything was said to you in reference to eating meat or eating pork, and if so, state what was said?

Answer. There was one fellow there instructed me not to eat meat.

Q. Who was he?

A. James Crisinger. He was employed in the institution as an attendant.

Q. What did he say?

A. He told me not to eat the meat, for it was diseased.

From the testimony of J. C. Johnson—trustee's witness.

Question. Can you remember any circumstances connected with the seeing of the dead hogs?

Answer. These that were dead were down on the English farm. They had come hogs that had the cholera—I think they said it was the cholera—I don't know what it was, and they got some of the hogs that were fat hogs they wanted killed, and I went down to kill the hogs in a field, where there were two or three dead hogs being taken out.

From the testimony of James Hunt—trustee's witness.

Question. Is it not a fact that you frequently killed hogs in the drove that had hogs in it that were dying of disease?

Answer. There were some of them died, but I could not say what they died of, whether they died of cholera or whether they were over-fed, or not.

From the testimony of John N. Navin, veterinary surgeon.

Question. Did any of the hogs die?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How many of that lot?

A. Between eighteen, twenty-five and thirty.

Q. Of what disease did they die?

A. They had died of cholera.

Q. Were these hogs in a pen or in an open field, or where?

A. In an open field.

Q. What did you do?

A. With the patients I took with me from the ward and the other attendant that went with me and Mr. Hunt, the butcher, helped us drive the hogs up to the pen.

Q. All the hogs together?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were any dead hogs in the way?

A. Yes, sir; we drove them over some dead hogs.

Q. When you got them into the pen, what did you do?

A. We picked out what hogs we thought were fit to be killed.

Q. And killed them?

A. Yes, sir; we killed the best-looking ones in the crowd.

Q. What about hogs dying about that time?

A. Yes, sir; some of them were not really able to walk on there by themselves unless there was a little willow behind and pricking them up a little with a stick.

Q. What was the reason they could not walk—apparently sick?

A. Sick; yes, sir. It appeared to me that they had the blind staggers, and they really had the symptoms of cholera. I know, honestly, they really had the cholera. I could tell that by the way they acted.

From the testimony of John A. Perkins, p. 1032—trustee's witness.

Question. What kind of hogs were they? Were they sick?

Answer. I do not think they were sick when they came there. There wasn't many of those that died. There was something over a hundred; I do not remember just the number of that lot, but there was only five or six out of that number that died.

Q. Did you see some of those that lot that died after they died?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you see them while they were sick?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you think was the matter with those hogs?

A. I thought it was cholera.

Q. Were you present when any of them were butchered?

A. Yes, sir; all of them. I was there when the majority of them were butchered.

Q. What did they do with the hogs that died?

A. Hauled them off and sold them.

Q. Let us take another lot of hogs. Do you know of any other large lot of hogs of which any were sick?

A. There was a small lot driven there by somebody. I do not know who; I think probably fifteen, and I think all of those died—every one of them.

Q. What did they look like when you first saw them?

A. I thought they were sick, and I told Dr. Fletcher I thought they were a sickly lot of hogs when they came there; I didn't think they were much account.

Q. What is your best judgment about the number of the next lot?

A. It seems to me it was near one hundred.

Q. About how many of them died?

A. I think the most of them died.

Q. They were sick hogs when they were brought there, and began dying soon after they came there, and died on until they killed them. When they began to die so fast they died butcher any of those down at the other place?

Q. You say they kept killing this lot you are speaking of now? Had they killed any of them for the table?

A. Yes, sir.

From the testimony of W. S. Johnson, p. 1173.

Question. I call your attention to the hogs; do you know if they have kept hogs out there at the hospital?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever see any killing?

A. Yes, sir; I have seen them kill hogs quite often.

Q. State what is the fact as to your having seen them kill hogs there from a drove when there were dead hogs lying around?

A. Last summer I was farming a piece of land. I raised my own corn for my team, and I was going down there to see my team, and I was going out on the L. & N. railroad. The hogs were dying at the hospital, and they had made a pen out there along the L. & N. railroad, between the creek and the creek, just below the mill dam, and as I was going out there in their killing and putting them into a two-horse wagon, and taking them over near the pen where they dressed them.

Q. Were there any dead hogs around there when they were killing?

A. Yes, sir; the hogs were dying. I had been past there quite often and seen them lying around in the hog pen there.

From the testimony of William Cain, p. 176.

Question. As to your butchering experience—I want to know if you ever saw any hogs there with cholera, or diseased hogs?

Answer. I saw them there what I supposed were diseased hogs with cholera. I saw them lying dead in the pens.

Q. Do you know anything about who bought those hogs?

A. No, sir; I do not know any more than what I heard the farm-hands say there. There was one time a car-load of hogs came there, and I saw them when they were at the hospital. I saw them when they were at the hospital. I saw them when they were at the hospital.

Q. What was their appearance?

A. Very sickly appearance, and very delicate.

Q. How was that observable?

A. Their hair was kind of curled and sick-looking, and they had the appearance of a sick hog. I have been raised on a farm, and I say they looked like they had the cholera.

Q. You know when you see a diseased hog whether it has cholera or not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you helped to kill hogs where did you take the hogs from?

A. They were knocked in the pen with an ax.

Q. Were they in separate droves there?

A. No, sir; they were all run together. Some of them were separated in pens. The pens were there altogether.

Q. Were there any diseased hogs there?

A. Yes, sir; I saw hogs lying in the pens dead.

Q. At the same time you took out some live ones to kill?

A. Yes, sir.

New York City's Big Registry.

Special to Courier-Journal.

The Sunday but one before the election was made a busy day by the local Democrats. The leaders and workers were seen everywhere, telling for the ticket. The great registration is the subject of conversation in political circles, and there is grave apprehension on both sides that many fraudulent voters have been registered. The registration of 33,015 voters yesterday, though the number of the vote is not yet known, is a record for the enormous figure of 286,547. This beats the record of one of eight, for it shows an increase over the previous year of 53,111, over that of 1884 of 45,641, and over that of 1880 of 79,613. The last day of registration was marked by but few arrests of illegal voters, but a few days will doubtless see many behind prison bars. Inspector Byrnes had men stationed in many registry places, on the lookout for colonists, and just what the results of their observations were will soon be made slowly plain. A study of the figures shows an increase in every Assembly district in the city, as compared with the registration of last year, and also 1884 and 1880. The increase is more marked in some districts than in others, but, on the whole, is really phenomenal.

Belittling West.

Philadelphia Record (Dem.).

The British minister plays tennis and takes walks. That is about the size of it all. Ordinarily he is known as "Old Silence." At dinner and at parties, as at conferences and negotiations, West has been as silent as a dead clam. One night at a party last winter he stood silently contemplating the dancers so long that a young society man thought he was slowly retiring. In order to save him the young man moved up to him as though inviting conversation. For a full minute West, who knew him perfectly well, looked steadily and silently at him. Then he suddenly dropped his single eye-glasses and ejaculated: "Let's have some sherry!" which was his entire conversation for that evening. Nor did any suppose until this week that West could write. The fact is that West is too old for work. Forty-three years ago he entered the British diplomatic service as a clerk to the Earl of Aberdeen, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Ever since then he has been slowly dying on. Attached at Lisbon and Berlin, secretary at Paris, Madrid, Berlin and Paris, chargé d'affaires occasionally, and finally minister to the Argentine Republic, to Spain and to the United States, he has long since left his wits behind him.

A Word to the Workman.

Philadelphia Press.

The man who saved the limb he was sitting in was wise by the side of the workman who votes against his own wages.

The old saying "opposition is the life of business" has not been sustained in one instance at since its introduction into the Democratic Cough Syrup all other cough remedies have been dead stock and the vendors are in despair.

## DID NOT LIKE CLEVELAND.

Another Significant Letter from Mr. Hendricks Relating to the President.

A Racy Address to the Democrats of Indiana From One Who Was Close to the Vice-President and His Family.

Henry D. Pierce, nephew of the late Vice-President Hendricks, has from the beginning of the campaign been an ardent supporter of Gen. Harrison's election. The Democratic press, following the lead of the Sentinel, has never ceased to abuse him. In the following letter he meets his slanderers with an array of facts that should lead Indiana Democrats to place the seal of condemnation upon Grover Cleveland:

"To the Democrats of Indiana:

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."

"The Indianapolis Sentinel, confessedly a strong paper, instead of attempting to meet the issue raised by the letter of the late Vice-President, has chosen to ignore it, in content to heap abuse upon me personally, in order to divert attention, if possible, from the fact in issue."